DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 114 CS 502 166

AUTHOR Lent, John A.
TITLE Mass Communications in the Third World: Some Ethical Considerations.
PUB DATE Jul 78
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association Summer Conference on Intercultural/International Communication (2nd, Tampa, Florida, July 17-21, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communications; *Developing Nations; *International Relations; Journalism; *Mass Media; Media Research; *Propaganda; *Technological Advancement

ABSTRACT

In the past five years, unprecedented discussion and analysis have been focused on mass media in the third world. Common topics include development journalism, the New Information Order, cultural invasion and exchange, and ruralization of media. Ethical considerations for first world involvement in third world media have arisen in several areas. To thrust sophisticated technological and economic systems on the media of developing countries encourages them to bypass intermediate stages of development, thus fostering exploitation and dependency. The mass media have been treated as the playthings of the urban elite, often for frivolous reasons, while the needs of the rural majority have been ignored. The promotion of foreign-oriented content in third world mass media causes these societies to be passive recipients of distorted, inadequate, and biased information. The concept of development journalism has, in practice, meant "government say-so" journalism, resulting in authoritarian media policies. To conduct mass communications training and research in the framework of urbanized nations, rather than looking at indigenous needs and problems, leads to cultural imperialism. Two camps, aligned with Eastern and Western ideologies, have formed on either side of these issues. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157114

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mass Communications in The Third World: Some Ethical Considerations

by John A. Lent
Professor of Communications
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. Lent

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented at Speech Communication Association Second Summer Conference on Intercultural/International Communication, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, July 17-21, 1978.

(In preparing this paper, the author has quoted liberally from some of his previously-published work.)

CS502166

Mass Communications in the Third World:
Some Ethical Considerations

by John A. Lent
Professor of Communications
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa. 19122

At no time have the Third World mass media come in for more controversial discussion and analysis than in the past half decade. The trade and academic periodicals, as well as the popular press, numerous national and international conferences and seminars, the United States Senate and UNESCO, among others, have discussed concepts such as development journalism, New Information Order, cultural invasion/exchange and ruralization of media, all common Third World topics, with regularity.

This paper deals with such topics and is organized under the following five problems:

1. Thrusting sophisticated technological and big business economic systems upon mass media of developing countries--systems that encourage them to leap intermediate stages of development.

Mass media development has followed the path of all development in the Third World, being oriented almost entirely towards economics. Bigness for bigness sake, turning a financial profit, imitation of media of industrial nations and leaping intermediate stages of development have been its characteristics.

The result has been that the ppor, small and new states of the Third World, seeking big media as paraphernalia of modernity, yet unable to afford them in-

dependently and unaware or uncaring about their long-term effects, have created miniature replicas of Western or Eastern print and broadcast operations designed for more commercial or more controlled societies. If Third World nations chose the Western model, they adopted the factors that commercialism depends upon--mass audience, standardized appeal and "want-creating machinery that the consumer goods producers, who sponsor the shows, demand and receive."[1] They were ignorant of (or ignored) the long, slow development of capital-intensive systems of the West. They neither had the capacity to produce or consume such sophisticated media, thus, they were forced to accept packages that tied their media to foreign financial sponsorship, in the process creating dependency situations in programming, training and equipment acquisition. (In cases where indigenization of the media took place, the only agencies capable of affording the large outlays of capital needed were the local government and political parties, which in turn used the media for their own vested interests.)

If these nations chose the Eastern model, they adopted the characteristics of socialist media--systematically controlled and owned by party and state, campaign oriented and authoritarian. And, again they were dependent upon an outside agency.

It did not matter whether the outside support came from bilateral or multilateral agreements; the exploitation and dependency were still present. If supranational agencies (such as those of the United Nations) helped initiate Third World Media systems, agreements for technology, training and programming were often linked to the nation from which the supranational agency consultant emanated.

As Bordenave pointed out, for years communications and development meant manipulation and indoctrination, setting up a situation where developing nations were implored to adopt the values, social organization and technology of the

more advanced nations.[2]

Only recently has it been commonly acknowledged that growthmania in mass communications can waste a great deal of precious energy and resources of newly-developed states, and is not necessarily better or more effective.[3] In some quarters, there are efforts at creating appropriate media technology for these states in the form of wall and blackboard newspapers, loudspeaker systems, audio cassette technology (ACT) or sharing of facilities, staff and resources by a nation's mass media.

2. Treating mass media as playthings of urban elites by initiating expensive media, often for frivolous reasons; simultaneously ignoring needs of the rural peoples who represent the majority of the populations.

When Third World mass media were initiated in the fashion mentioned above, they usually became frivolous playthings of a select group of urbanites. For years, Third World newspapers have been concentrated in capital cities, and most mass media content has been irrelevant to the rural masses. Television especially has been developed, as Katz and Wedell[4] point out, as a "jewel for the tired and spent bourgeoisie," at the same time siphoning off funds from much more mass-oriented radio. The introduction of an expensive medium such as television has often been irresponsibly implemented for curious and haphazard reasons. Indonesia, for example, started a television service to cover the Asian Games in 1962; Uganda introduced color television to cover Idi Amin's 1975 wedding; Peru established the medium to celebrate a government's first year in power, and Thailand went to color to cover a Miss Thailand beauty contest. At other times, television has been introduced as a pacifier or diversionary gadget for restless city folk.

In the mid-1970s, there has been a growing awareness that many of the formal mass media have not related to rural peoples, being written in languages only urban elites understood and about topics that had very little to do with the 80 per cent of the Third World labelled "peasantry." Also, it has become apparent that contents of some of these media have not only been non-applicable and irrelevant, but dangerous to national values, morals, and in some cases, people's health and well-being.[5]

A number of writers now question the communications and development process that for years neglected the masses. Bordenave said that mass media messages have been urban-oriented, and that mass media penetrate "very insignificantly into some rural areas"--print because of illiteracy; broadcasting because of the commercial owners who find it more profitable to aim broadcasts at richer, urban consumers.[6] Freire described present communications and education systems as tools for the domination and domestication of the masses, "merely transferring content from a knowledgeable and authoritative source to a passive receiver (which) does nothing to promote the receiver's growth as a person with an autonomous and critical conscience capable of contributing to and influencing his society."[7]

Out of this thinking has come the notion that rural people should have more access to communications media, not as receivers only, but as sources and actors. Rogers, a chief designer of the older communications and development paradigm, claimed that a new conceptualization might include: 1. equality of distribution of information and socioeconomic benefits, 2. popular participation in self development planning and execution, 3. self-reliance and independence, and 4. integration of traditional with modern systems of media.[8] Bordenave cited several innovations in rural communications:

> ...media are becoming more accessible to the participation of rural populations in programming; messages are originated among the

rural populations, and government agents, technocrats and elites--who previously always acted as sources--are learning to become receivers; the content of the messages is more relevant to rural people's problems and needs; rural people are learning to formulate and articulate their ideas and feelings about matters important to them; the government is learning to communicate less paternalistically and with less authoritarianism, making possible a dialogue with rural populations; new technologies--such as audio and video tape recording--are making it possible to register messages and feedback from all parties in the dialogues, facilitating mutual perception and understanding.[9]

The United Nations also is considering how communications skills can be used to promote national and collective self-reliance among the two billion people of the developing South, hoping to reopen ancient lines of contact, to build multiple links and to help these people of 150 developing nations to pool and share common experiences. Called Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC), the United Nations proposal aims to stop wholesale importation of ideas from the industrialized North and to alleviate the one-way transmit- and- receive dynamic which traveled from capital city to rural area.[10]

Some nations, notably India, Indonesia, Philippines and Tanzania, have developed rural satellite communications systems and nationwide rural newspapers on an elaborate scale; others have gone a different route, keeping costs low, media small, and contents simple, relevant and non-violent. Wall and blackboard newspapers, using "barefoot journalists" (local volunteers who gather news for the prestige it affords them), and audio cassette technology are examples of this intermediate technology. The cassette, because of its simplicity, durability, portability and low cost, has been successfully used throughout the Third World as a form of participatory communications. Folk media, intimate with the masses, rich in variety, readily available at low

cost, relished by different age groups and both sexes, and known as persuasive theme carriers, are increasingly being used to bring about social change, as are interpersonal communications networks. Besides employing folk media in their traditional rural settings, most Third World nations have begun to experiment with adapting them to mass media such as press, radio, television and film.

All of these are encouraging trends. However, continual evaluation is called for to assure the integrity of sponsoring organizations of rural communications projects. Questions that must be asked regularly are: What does the sponsoring agency expect to happen? Are the realistic needs of rural people taken into consideration or are the development programs merely testing and promoting new hardware? Eventually, it is hoped that the ultimate question be asked and answered in the negative, and that is: Do villagers need outside help in the implementation of their communications processes?

3. Promoting foreign-originated content to Third World mass media, to the extent that these societies now feel they have been passive recipients of distorted, inadequate and biased information.

For sometime, the discussion on dependency dealt predominantly with economics; again since the 1970s, intangible influences on attitudes, values, perceptions and tastes--summed up in the word "cultural"--have bothered Third World governments. Among the instruments molding culture that are considered powerful and sometimes dangerous are imported films, television programs, novels, magazines and news.

The Third World complaint is that the free flow of information has led to a one-way flow--from the rich and powerful to the weak and impoverished societies, and that "the majority of countries are reduced to being passive recipients of biased, inadequate and distorted information." The numerous conferences (many sponsored by UNESCO) that have dealt with this information

imbalance call for a balanced flow of information and an end to what has been called "cultural imperialism or aggression."

As Righter said, some supporters of the balanced flow argue that they do not seek to,

> block the free flow of information, but to make it genuinely free--free of the domination exercised by the powerful few, free of 'alien' values, free...'to defend the interests of society as a whole, and the rights of entire peoples.' Free of manipulations of the market, and thus able to be used as the lynchpin of a truly independent, new social order.[11]

Other proponents of what has come to be known as the New Information Order, see a conspiracy whereby the United States and other advanced nations use the international media to keep developing nations down, to promote Western military/industrial complexes. They are prone to heap all the blame for their nations' problems on the international media apparatus controlled by the United States and other Western nations.

They point out that the American film, for example, with markets in more than 80 countries, occupies more than 50 per cent of world screen time, and that every moment of any day, an American film is being shown someplace on earth. They show that the United States, the major originator of television programs for international distribution, followed by England, France and West Germany, led markets in the mid-1960s by exporting more than twice as many programs as all other countries combined. They stress that three worldwide newsfilm agencies (VISNEWS, UPITN and CBS-Newsfilm), all British or American owned, are dominant in world distribution and that nearly all broadcasters in the world must use film from these agencies.[12]

They quote figures showing that a few major Western publishers and producers dominate the international circulation of newspapers and periodicals; that Reader's Digest, with 26 international editions in 12 languages, has a circulation of 13 million outside the United States; that Time and Newsweek

are becoming global weekly newsmagazines, and that Walt Disney publications have worldwide audiences. They argue that the United States control of advertising in the Third World is very pronounced, quoting scholars such as Schiller who reported that a study of the,

> presence of foreign advertising affiliates among the five largest agencies of 46 developing countries in 1973 revealed that 'in all countries, and for each of the 135 agencies on which data were available, foreign ownership--whether majority or minority--means (with one exception) that the parent agency is either entirely North American or has strong United States participation. More specifically, in 29 of these 46 countries, the largest advertising agency is foreign majority-owned and in an additional four countries foreigners have acquired an often substantial minority interest....in only 13 (or 28 per cent) of the 46 countries, the biggest agency is entirely owned by nationals....In terms of the 135 agencies, nearly two-thirds are foreign majority-owned, 9 per cent have foreign minority participation and less than 30 per cent are entirely in national hands.' Five foreign (United States) agencies control two-thirds of all the firms in the 46 country survey.[13]

They feel there is ideological aggression when four major international news agencies (Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters, Agence France Presse), all concentrated in the West, control the international flow of news (informing the West about the Third World and vice versa, and also the Third World about themselves); when their own radio transmitters are drowned out by stronger equipment of Voice of America, British Broadcasting Corporation, Radio France or Deutsche Welle (unfortunately, they usually do not mention Radio Peking or Radio Moscow); when most of their television content is imported, partly because they cannot afford to produce large portions of their own programs, and when modern technology, such as satellites, is controlled by these same superpowers.

In an effort to change this imbalance, Third World governments are aligning to develop news, information and programming exchanges and regional newspools, and to work out systematized policies on communications for each country. In their deliberations (at conferences usually funded by UNESCO and attended by large numbers of representatives of government owned media), Third World media and government personnel have recommended, among other things, that governments insure by law that government controlled national news agencies be "exclusively empowered" to disseminate news from outside the region referring to the internal affairs of each country; that regional news agencies be formed with governments taking legal measures "to provide a defense against the competition of agencies outside the region"; that individual states be responsible "for all mass media under their jurisdiction," including international news agencies stationed in those nations; that individual states be allowed to arrest correspondents from international news organizations if their papers or agencies published anything critical of the country where the correspondent was stationed.

Not all of these recommendations have been ratified. However, because they have been seriously broached, a number of questions are in order. For example, who is empowered to determine how a nation is covered in the international press? Do individual nations have a right to control all news and information entering and leaving their borders? Once a Third World nation adopts modern media such as television (which are expensive and program devourers), how will that nation satisfy the growing and demanding audiences if it decides to drastically replace supplies of inexpensive foreign programming with local shows, especially if the resources to produce the latter are not fully developed? Is it not possible that supranational organizations are also practicing cultural imperialism and/or aggression in their attempts to integrate--homogenize or make similar--communications policies in nations with very diverse traditions? As the Third World bloc grows in numbers and strength, have

not some of the supranational organizations found themselves--perhaps for fear of being termed pro-Western, racist or imperialistic--victims of Third World blackmail? Is it not possible that as the Third World nationalized, and otherwise controlled, larger segments of its mass media, the UNESCO panels of "experts" setting national and international communications policies are and will be made up of disproportionately larger representations of government media personnel bent on promoting more stringent control? Does not the developed nations have an obligation to export more appropriate fare to Third World nations, at the same time engaging in news and information exchanges with the Third World to better educate Western audiences of that important part of the world?

4. Redefining the development journalism concept (by supranational bodies and new ruling cliques) to imply "government-say-so journalism," the result being most of the Third World practices authoritarian philosophies concerning mass communications.

A phenomenon that has swept the Third World during the past decade has been that of development communications--the systematic use of communications in support of national development. An expansion of the more objective and indepth development journalism of the 1960s, the concept today is considered the main propaganda technique of many developing governments.

The individuals who conceived development journalism in the 1960s believed that because national development depends so heavily upon economics, there should be better trained and informed economics specialists among journalists, to cover and report fully, impartially and simply the myriad problems of a developing nation. Development journalism came out of Asia--more specifically the Philippines--through the efforts of journalists such as Juan Mercado and Alan Chalkley and organizations such as Philippine Press Institute (1963) and Press Foundation of Asia (1967), both originally located in Manila. Thus, it was initiated by journalists and funded by non-government contributions to in-

sure that the development story was covered indepth, but simply enough for mass consumption.

In the early 1970s, however, as Third World governments realized that development journalism could be useful in pushing their ideologies and campaigns, the term was transformed into commitment journalism systematically applied to a nation's problems. At the same time, it was widened to include all aspects of communications, as evidenced in this commonly-used definition:

> Development communication is the art and science of human communication applied to the speedy transformation of a country from poverty to a dynamic state of economic growth that makes possible greater economic social equality and the larger fulfillment of the human potential.[14]

Various government ministries, with support from the United Nations and other multi-national and outside funding agencies, encourgged integrated national communications policies already mentioned to tackle problems of poverty, population and health.

The change that occurred moved one of the original thinkers on the subject, Alan Chalkley, to lament that development journalism had been used by governments to mean "government-say-so journalism," having been "overshadowed by administrative blight" and "official flackery."[15]

Emphasis on development communications definitely changed mass media-government relationships. Governments realized that if media were to be used to implement national development strategies, then the authorities had to have control of them. The results were more employment of subtle guidelines issued to media and a redefining of traditional ideas of democracy and freedom of the press, backed up with authoritarian machinery that could be used when needed.

Thus, guidance and cooperation became the key words in media relationships

with government. The explanations from Third World leaders went something like this: Because Third World nations are newly emergent, they need time to develop their institutions. During this initial period of growth, stability and unity must be sought; criticism must be minimized and the public faith in governmental institutions and policies must be encouraged. Media must cooperate, according to this guided press concept, by stressing positive, development-inspired news, by ignoring negative societal or oppositionist characteristics and by supporting governmental ideologies and plans.[16] The result was that two value systems hit head on. In the traditional one, the press is the watchdog of government and supervisor of the public good; in the newer version, the press is the tool of development, deferring to authority and usually propagandizing for officialdom.[17]

To overcome this dichotomy of values, Third World leaders have resorted to redefining concepts such as democracy and press freedom to meet Third World goals. They say that in their efforts to help their people and to strive for national unity, they cannot afford an irresponsible press which undermines their efforts. In effect, they say, "he who is not with us is against us."[18] At other times, the explanation is that press freedom is not a top priority of a developing nation, that the emphasis must be on satisfying immediate material needs of food, shelter and health. Another reason officials give for not accepting the "luxury of Western style press freedom" is that developing nations face internal and external threats of instability.[19] Investigative and critical journalism, as practiced in the West, is inhibited in the Third World, other officials explain, by cultural traits such as respect for elders and leaders.

Simultaneous with these exhortations from government officials has been the growth of a wide variety of authoritarian tendencies in the Third World.

One dominant trend is towards centralized government, with one strong person rule and in-family power concentrations. These ruling cliques, when they find they cannot cope with communal strife or dissent, simply shuffle aside constitutional guarantees by issuing emergency or martial law decrees.

Under such trying conditions, maintaining an independent press becomes virtually impossible as governments promulgate and alter press laws, suspend newspapers and arrest journalists, restructure media to include more official management and ownership, levy economic sanctions against mass media and control foreign correspondents and the images they impart of the developing world.

As been indicated, the major impetus for the adoption of development communications and national communications policies has come from supranational agencies, chief of which is UNESCO. At a 1971 UNESCO meeting in Paris, it was proposed that in each country, a national communications policy council be formed, "made up of opinion leaders in political, economic, media, and educational sectors, and that ultimately, communication planning units evolve."[20] UNESCO thinking was that through integrated communications policies, waste would be eliminated. In short, all communications planning in any given nation would be systematized to act as an agent of planned educational and social change, and UNESCO would serve as "coordinating agent, free of political or commercial taint, at the planning and research level."[21] Explaining the philosophy behind the UNESCO plan, Alan Hancock, in 1972, assured that:

> Such a policy is not visualized as a piece of legislative censorship; nor is it seen as a planning mechanism which can be applied to the public sector only. It is intended to be a pragmatic design, in which channels and media, under both public and private ownership, are taken into account, with no more attempt to impose an autocratic structure than the culture and tradition of the country endorses. The policy proceeds from two premises. First, it must be based upon a view of the com-

munication process as a total process, looking at media in the widest possible economic, social, and political setting, and dealing with questions of utilization and response, as much as with production and distribution channels. Second, it must be based upon a complete review of the character and capacity of the country's communication networks.[22]

Subsequent events were to show that despite UNESCO's visualization, legislative censorship would be proposed. At various UNESCO-sponsored meetings in Latin America--the testing ground for the implementation of the UNESCO model of national communications policies, it was concluded that freedom of expression, when "closely and especially linked to free enterprise," constituted an imbalance in society; that commercially-owned media imposed alien cultural traits or conformity (both of which slowed social change), and that national communications policies should be formed.

As the results of these conferences were disclosed, UNESCO officials insisted that the agency was impartial on the role of mass media, that it only attempted to point out trends and offer alternatives. UNESCO spokesman said the recommendations of the conferences were based on personal opinions of "experts" never officially distributed by UNESCO, and that UNESCO was not careful in choosing its "experts." Others doubted the sincerity of UNESCO's statements, chief of which were IPI, IAPA and Freedom House.

Again, as development communications becomes a standard in the Third World (which it is becoming), a number of questions are begging for answers. First, in the realm of media-government relationships, it is obvious that traditional concepts of freedom of press have been changed in light of the stampede for the development communications bandwagon. In some instances, government ministers have tried to temper the resultant criticism by promising to allow more freedom of expression once their nations reach their development goals. The obvious questions: Who decides that a nation has reached

that goal? Assuming it has reached its desired stage of development, will that nation's ruling clique, who has grown fond of hearing only good things said about it, be willing to allow the media to criticize constructively? And even if the rulers do allow for this criticism later on, will the media, after years of guidance and self-restraint, be trusting, prepared and bold enough to accept the challenge?

Concerning the use of communications for promoting national ideologies and campaigns, pertinent queries seem to be: With most national development projects in the hands of government ministries, often authoritarian ones, are the media promoting the development programs or the personalities and campaigns of the officials behind them? Where is the thin dividing line between the two? What impact can messages disseminated by government media have in the many societies of the Third World where the people are generally suspicious of officialdom, having witnessed so much government inefficiency, corruption and insincerity in the past? If the critical function of the mass media has been stifled, how will government and the public be able to determine and respect sound and useful ideologies and campaigns and spurn vague and useless ones?[23]

5. Conducting mass communications training, education and research from metropolitan nations' frameworks, rather than looking at indigenous needs and problems.

The past 15 years have yielded an important quantitative growth in the number of journalism/communications training or education programs developed and the amount of mass communications research generated in the Third World. The emphasis on mass communications as a field of study has been aided by supranational or regional agencies such as UNESCO, Press Foundation of Asia, AMIC, CIESPAL and by national governments, all of which have established training, teaching and research centers, sponsored or conducted research

projects and provided the outlets for dissemination of research findings through seminars, conferences and new books and periodicals.

Because mass communications training, education and research originated in the industrialized nations (especially in the United States and Western Europe), naturally, Third World nations adopted theories and methods from these countries. Third World media practitioners, educators and researchers flocked to the United States and Europe to be trained or educated, and conversely, media personnel from the industrialized nations, on sabbatical or secondment, spent time in the developing world teaching or training the American, Western European or socialist way of communications, and testing their toolboxes of communications research instruments on developing world people.[24]

Gradually, problems became apparent. Media personnel trained in the industrialized nations found themselves frustrated as they learned to use advanced technology abroad that was not as available at home, or as they realized that the socio-cultural and political systems in the Western or socialist nations where they received their education or training did not blend well with their own societies' backgrounds and traits. The expatriate educator and researcher working in the Third World was equally frustrated. Usually lacking adequate time to learn the subtle cultural and political traits of the society in which he worked, the foreign consultant (even those with the best of intentions) taught and researched from the perspective he knew best--that of his own culture. It did not take long before he too was accused of cultural imperialism.

A particularly sensitive issue in the Third World is that of using research methods conceived in the industrialized nations. In the past five years, a number of writers, from both the developed and developing areas, have stated that some of these research methods may not be transferrable or they have called for modifications or an entirely different research em-

phasis. Among them, Beltran criticized Latin American communications research, claiming that the researchers have uncritically followed concpptual and methodological orientations established in the United States and Europe, without creating appropriate methodologies for the region.[25] Pausewang, who conducted research in Ethiopia, said survey research used in Africa will always be less reliable, more expensive, more difficult, less valid, less relevant and bound to produce more dangerous side effects than if carried out in an industrialized country.[26] He and numerous others[27] in Africa and Asia are convinced that because of cultural and language differences, it is impossible to conduct interviews in private, to obtain accurate information because of superstitions and etiquette and work patterns, to make subjects understand anonymity or to explain to them the necessity for the research. Feliciano and Lozare claimed that observational techniques have more pronounced problems in areas such as Asia than in industrialized nations because a high premium is placed on "smooth, interpersonal relations" by rural Asians, hastening the assimilation of the participant/observant into the local culture, as the same time making the collection, analysis and writing of the research much more subjective.[28]

Scholars involved in diffusion research, including Rogers,[29] have conceded that this method has not dealt with change-over-time aspects of the communications process, has focussed too heavily on the individual and not the social system to which he belongs, has dwelt on diffusion of technological innovations, not on diffusion of new ideas, ideologies, social relations or social values, has assumed a oneway dependency relationship which implies that the source of the innovation (industrialized West) is superior to the receiver of innovation (developing nations), and has omitted studying the crucial role

of interpersonal communications in diffusion.[30] Numerous others have mentioned the lack of research on interpersonal communications networks and the use of traditional or folk media.

Through a series of seminars sponsored by organizations such as UNESCO and AMIC, among others, Third World communications researchers have delineated a series of problems they encounter, including the applicability of research methods from industrialized nations. A Filipino researcher at one such conference said:

> It seems that within the Asian context, communication theories which have come to use out of Western approaches with heavy sociological-psychological orientations would not suffice; that additional frames of reference taken from artistic, literary, dramatic traditions and aesthetic practices might probably provide most significant insights into the ways a Filipino (or Asian) perceive and receive (sic) mass media messages.[31]

Questions worth asking here are: Is it possible to reinvent research conceptualizations and methodologies specifically designed for the Third World? Should Third World researchers develop, as suggested by Pausewang, an intermediate technology that does not burn more "resources than necessary and not try to be more exact than absolutely necessary, but rather as rough as permissible, but at the same time as comprehensive as possible"?[32] If Pausewang's solution is too drastic, how then can Western communications technology be adapted to developing nations?

Finally, a series of questions asked by Beltran points out the dilemma developing world communications researchers find themselves in:

> Is this passive and imitative attitude of communication researchers in less developed countries due to laziness and/or lack

of competence? Does the training received by communications researchers in less developed countries from American universities prevent them from perceiving their own reality? Or is this simply due to the relative newness of communication research in these countries? Is this lack of perceptiveness, creative imagination and audacity a trait of conformist and uncritical mentality that is submissive by definition to cultural colonialism?[33]

* * * * * * * * *

As these five issues continue to be discussed, what has become apparent is that two camps, reminiscent of the cold war of the 1950s, have emerged with socialist organizations such as International Organization of Journalists pitted against groups such as International Press Institute and Freedom House. This leads to the final question and that is: Whose communications policies are we talking about--those of the Third World nations or those of the East-West camps?

Definitely what is needed are clearer definitions of terms such as development journalism, free and balanced flow, New Information Order, right to communicate. We do not know precisely what the old information order was like or even if there were many old orders. We do not know, for sure, whether Third World governments really believe in development journalism as it was originally conceived. The entire controversy, after thousands of hours of conference time and millions of dollars of UNESCO and other agencies' money, is bogged down in a semantic quagmire where it is fashionable to invent new terminology before specifying the exact referents for the terms.

Footnotes

1 Herbert Schiller, Mass Communications and American Empire, Boston: Beacon, 1971, p. 114.

2 Juan E. Diaz Bordenave, Communication and Rural Development, Paris: UNESCO, 1977, p. 21.

3 See,for instance, Schramm's and Jamison's discussions on instructional television. Wilbur Schramm, Big Media, Little Media. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1977; Dean Jamison, Patrick Suppes and Stuart Wells, "The Effectiveness of Alternative Instructional Media, A Survey," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 44 (1974), pp. 1-67.

4 Elihu Katz and George Wedell, Broadcasting in the Third World, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977, p. 8.

5 John A. Lent, "Mads Media, Folk Media and Rural Masses in the Third World," paper presented at International Studies Association, Washington, D. C., February 24, 1978.

6 Bordenave, op. cit., p. 18.

7 Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Harmonsworth, Middx: Penguin Books, 1972.

8 Everett Rogers, "The Rise and Fall of the Dominant Paradigm," Journal of Communication, Winter 1978, p. 67.

9 Bordenave, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

10 Erskine Childers, "TCDC: Facing the Challenge of Contact Deprivation," Intermedia, December 1977, pp. 11-14; also, Bradford Morse, "A Challenge to Communicators," Intermedia, December 1977, p. 10.

11 Rosemary Righter, "IS Western-Style Journalism Appropriate to the Third World?" Nieman Reports, Summer 1978, p. 30.

12 See Tapio Varis, International Inventory of Television Programme Structure and the Flow of TV Programmes Between Nations, Tampere: University of Tampere, 1973.

13 Karl P. Sauvant, "Socio-Cultural Decolonization," Ceres, forthcoming, as quoted in Herbert Schiller, "Advertising and International Communications," Instant Research on Peace and Violence, 4/1976, pp. 177-178.

14 Nora C. Quebral, "What Do We Mean by Development Communication? International Development Review, February 1973, p. 25.

15 Alan Chalkley, "Development Journalism Is NOT 'Government-Say-So Journalism,'" Media, May 1975, p. 27.

16 See John A. Lent, "Press Freedom in Asia," Gazette, 1 (1978).

17 Media, June 1974, p. 5.

18 J. Clement Jones, "How Free Is the Press in the Commonwealth Countries?" Indian Press, May 1975, p. 11.

19 Ernest Corea, "Should Newspapers in Asia Be Freed?" Media Asia, 1:2, 1974, p. 10.

20 Alan Hancock, "UNESCO," in John A. Lent, Broadcasting in Asia and the Pacific, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978, p. 361.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid., pp. 360-361.

23 See John A. Lent,"The Guiding Light: Mass Media and National Ideology Formation and Propagation in Third World Nations," paper presented at Association for Education in Journalism, Madison, Wisconsin, August 24, 1977.

24 John A. Lent, "Imperialism Via Q-Sorts," The Democratic Journalist, No. 9, 1974, pp. 14-17.

25 Luis Beltran, "Research Ideologies in Conflict," Journal of Communication, Spring 1975.

26 Siegfried Pausewang, Methods and Concepts of Social Research in a Rural Developing Society, Munich: Weltforum Verlag, 1973, p. 113.

27 Frank Ugboajah, "Communications Research in Africa," Intermedia, December 1975, p. 10; Menkir Esayas, "Some Problems in Communications Research in Africa,"

in Communication Research in the Third World: The Need For Training, Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1976, pp. 30-32; Shelton A. Gunaratne, "Some Research Problems in Rural Sri Lanka," Media Asia, 2:3 (1975); Godwin Chu, "Problems of Cross-Cultural Communication Research," Journalism Quarterly, 41(1964):557-562; Max Ralis, et al., "Applicability of Survey Techniques in Northern India," Public Opinion Quarterly, 27(1958):245-250; Sheldon Appleton, "Survey Research on Taiwan," Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter 1976-1977, p. 469; Newell Grenfell, "Market Research Comes of Age," Media for Asia's Communications Industry, April 1974, pp. 7-11; Gloria D. Feliciano and Benjamin V. Lozare, "Using Western Social Research Methodology in Rural Asia: Problems and Prospects," in P.R.R. Sinha, Communication and Rural Change, Singapore: AMIC, 1976, p. 80; Gloria D. Feliciano, "An Overview of Communication Research in Asia: Status, Problems and Needs," Honolulu: Papers of East-West Communication Institute, No. 6, June 1973, p. 9; Jack Glattbach, "The Problem with 'Damned Lies' and Statistics," Media for Asia's Communications Industry, April 1974, p. 11.

28 Feliciano and Lozare, op. cit., p. 83.

29 Everett Rogers, "Where Are We in Understanding the Diffusion of Innovations?" in Wilbur Schramm and Daniel Lerner, eds., Communication and Change: The Last Ten Years--and The Next, Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1976, p. 210. See also: K. E. Eapen, "Specific Problems of Research and Research Training in Asian/African Countries," in Communication Research in the Third World: The Need for Training, op. cit., p. 20.

30 Syed A. Rahim, "Diffusion Research--Past, Present and Future," in Schramm and Lerner, op. cit., pp. 223-225.

31 Josefina Patron, paper presented at AMIC conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, May 29-June 1, 1972.

32 Pausewang, op. cit., p. 196.

33 Beltran, quoted in Benjamin Lozare, untitled Ph. D. dissertation proposal, University of Wisconsin, 1977.